REMARKS

By way of this amendment, claims 1 and 18 have been amended and new claim 20 is presented. Claims 9-16 were withdrawn by the Examiner pursuant to a restriction requirement. Accordingly, claims 1-8, 17 and 18 have been examined and remain present in this application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

In the latest Office Action, claims 1-8, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner indicated that claim 1 recites "type" which renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear what "type" was intended to convey. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 18 to delete the word "type" to remove any alleged indefiniteness. Additionally, the Examiner indicated that the interpretation was made more difficult by the fact that the zeolites defined in the dependent claims were not within the genus of the type of zeolites defined in the independent claim. Applicants submit that nowhere do any of the claims recite "zeolites." Applicants request that the Examiner please point to a specific claim and clarify this rejection. By way of the amendment of claim 1, Applicants are of the position that the claims, as amended, are not indefinite and the rejection to claims 1-8, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, should therefore be withdrawn, which action is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-8, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Ribak (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0085043 A1). The Examiner stated "Ribak also discloses a context-responsive display system and method that includes an identifier for identifying the personalized context information which is the screen showing the identification of person who calling in (Ribak, FIG. 5, 130)." The Examiner further stated "Ribak inherently discloses the vehicle driver as an agent who can download personal context information to one or more of the vehicle devices." Applicants have amended independent claim 1, and for the reasons discussed below, Applicants submit that Ribak does not teach each and every feature of Applicants' claims, as amended.

The Ribak patent publication discloses a context-responsive display system for displaying graphic user interface elements to provide information to the driver of a vehicle. The Ribak display system includes an in-vehicle display 10 and a processor 30 for displaying vehicle-function monitors 40. The items of information shown on the display are set according to driver preferences (see paragraph 77). The appearance of the display, as well as settings, may be set according to specific driver preferences stored in memory of processor 30 (see paragraph 86). The personal preferences may be input by a driver via setup-screens on display 10, or other methods such as input from a PDA or an MP3 player by an infrared link, according to some examples (see paragraph 87). While driver preferences are input to processor 30 for use in the display system, the Ribak display system simply does not analyze received information and identify the information related to a person as personal context information, identify the information related to the environment as environmental context information, and identify the information related to the vehicle as vehicle context information.

In contrast, Applicants' claimed invention, as recited in claim 1, as amended, is directed to a system for providing and delivering personalized context information for use with onboard vehicle devices. The system includes an input accessing and receiving context information and an identifier analyzing the received information and identifying the information related to a person as personal context information, identifying the information related to the environment as environmental context information, and identifying the information related to the vehicle as vehicle context information. The system also includes a data storage device having memory storing the personal context information, the environmental context information, and the vehicle context information. An interface communicates the data storage device with a plurality of onboard vehicle devices. The system further includes an agent performing context filtering and downloading personal context information, environmental context information, and vehicle context information to one or more of the vehicle devices.

In order to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every limitation of the claim. Nowhere does Ribak disclose a system of providing and delivering personal context information that employs an input, an identifier, a data storage device, an interface and an agent,

as claimed. In particular, Ribak fails to disclose an identifier analyzing the received information and identifying the information related to a person as personal context information, identifying the information related to the environment as environmental context information, and identifying the information related to the vehicle as vehicle context information. Additionally, Ribak fails to disclose the storage of the personal context information, the environmental context information and the vehicle context information, interface, and an agent performing context filtering and download requested personal context information, environmental context information, and vehicle context information to one or more of the vehicle devices. The Examiner stated Ribak inherently discloses the vehicle driver as an agent who can download personal context information to one or more vehicle devices. Applicants would like to point out that Ribak does not teach the vehicle driver as an agent performing context filtering and downloading requested personal context information, environmental context information, and vehicle context information to one or more of the vehicle devices. Applicants have further added new claim 20 which recites that the system includes a compute platform, wherein the platform stores and executes the agent.

In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, Ribak simply stores personal preferences that are learned or input into memory in the processor 30 and makes the personal preference information available. This is completely different from the claimed invention, which analyzes information and identifies the information related to a person as personal context information, identifies the information related to the environment as environmental context information, and identifies the information related to the vehicle as vehicle context information. Even if the vehicle driver could act as an agent, as the Examiner argues Ribak inherently discloses, nowhere does the vehicle driver perform context filtering and download requested personal context information, environment context information and vehicle context information to one or more of the vehicle devices.

In the Office Action, the Examiner further stated that the statements of intended use or field of use, "for accessing...", "for analyzing...", "for storing...", "for communicating...", "for downloading..." clauses are essentially method limitations or statements of intended or desired use and, thus, the claim as well as other statements of intended use do not serve to patentably

distinguish the claimed structure over that of the reference. Applicants have amended claim 1 to eliminate repeated recitation of the word "for", and submit that the claim elements reciting an input accessing, an identifier analyzing, a data storage device having member storing, an interface communicating, and an agent performing context filtering and downloading, are all structural elements of the claimed invention, in contrast to an intended use of the apparatus, and therefore the claim elements as set forth in the claims must be considered.

Accordingly, claims 1-8, 17 and 18, as amended, are not anticipated by Ribak, and the rejection of claims 1-8, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) should therefore be withdrawn, which action is respectfully solicited.

By way of the foregoing discussion, Applicants have demonstrated that the claims are not anticipated by Ribak, and the rejection of claims 1-8, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) should therefore be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks and amendments, it is submitted that claims 1-8, 17, 18 and 20, as amended, define patentable subject matter and are in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the patentability of any of the claims, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

August 18, 2006
Date

Kevin T. Grzelak, Registration No. 35 169
Price, Heneveld, Cooper, Dewitt & Litton, LLP
695 Kenmoor, S.E.
Post Office Box 2567
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501
(616) 949-9610

KTG/jrb